

Applicant : Andreas Muth
Appln. No. : 11/539,152
Page : 7

REMARKS

Claims 20-48 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

According to the Office Action, the present application includes three groups of inventions that lack unity of invention under PCT Rule 13.1. According to the Office Action, the present application includes Group I including claims 20-40, Group II including claims 41-48 and Group III including claims 49-52. According to the Office Action, Applicants must select one of these Groups for proceeding in the present application.

Applicants provisionally elect Group II for proceeding in the present application, with traverse. According to the Office Action, there is a disunity of invention between Groups I-III because U.S. Patent No. 3,077,426 discloses a feature of a claim in Group III. However, the Office Action has not set out a disunity of invention between the claims of Group I and Group II and Applicant submits that there is unity of invention between the claims of Group I and Group II. Furthermore, Applicant submits that the claims of Group I and Group II clearly have unity of invention as set forth in MPEP §1893.03(e) and §1850(III)(A)(B).

Accordingly, Applicant submits that all pending claims 20-48 should be examined in this application and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

January 9, 2008

Date


Marcus P. Dolce, Registration No. 46 073
Price, Heneveld, Cooper, DeWitt & Litton, LLP
695 Kenmoor, S.E.
Post Office Box 2567
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501
(616) 949-9610

MPD/csd